DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 054 735 HE 002 535

AUTHOR Pettman, Philip J.

TITLE Student Evaluation of Faculty: 1965-1970. An Annotated Bibliography.

INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. University Measurement Services Center.

NOTE 16p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29

DESCRIPTORS *Annotated Bibliographies; *Evaluation Criteria; *Faculty Evaluation; Higher Education; *Research; *Student Evaluation; Surveys

ABSTRACT

This annotated bibliography on student evaluation of faculty contains articles published between 1965 and 1970. The 107 articles are divided into the following categories: surveys; factor analytic surveys (usually authors of these studies address themselves to different questions than do authors of non-factor analytic surveys); experiments (in these studies, 1 or more independent variables is actively manipulated); reviews; and non-empirical articles. (JS)

ED054735

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY: 1965-1970
AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY[1]

Philip J. Pettman
University Measurement Services Center
University of Minnesota

Evaluation of instruction is primary to the functioning of an educational institution. Although there are many methods to evaluate teaching, much controversy has revolved around the development of instruments to measure student evaluation of instruction.

Coverage. This report covers articles concerning college student evaluation of faculty members published between January, 1965 and December, 1970. Four sources were searched[2]: Research in Education, Current Index to Journals in Education, Education Index, and Psychological Abstracts. The articles located through these sources were then examined for additional references.

Organization. The articles are categorized into five groups:

1) Surveys--Differential observation. Includes quasi experiments in which an independent variable is not actively manipulated.

2) Factor Analytic Surveys--same as 1) above, but factor analysis is used in the analysis of the data. In consequence, the authors of these studies usually address themselves to different questions than the authors of non-factor analytic surveys do.

3) Experiments--One or more independent variables is actively manipulated.

4) Reviews--Articles which include reference to published data by other investigators.

5) Non-empirical articles--Only a sampling of these unimportant articles is included. None are annotated. They are polemic and often demonstrate some of the misleading statements made about student evaluation of faculty in the absence of knowledge of the empirical literature.

Referencing. Articles which were not published in a journal or book include a six-digit ED number in the reference. These articles can be obtained (in microfiche or hard cover) by writing:

ERIC Document Reproduction Service
Leasco Information Products
4827 Rugby Avenue
Bethesda, Maryland 20014

Doctoral dissertations. Ph.D. theses are included but unannotated because they were not examined.

---

[1]Thanks are sincerely expressed to Arlene Tervakoski for typing this paper.

[2]Deborah Lorenson's assistance in the library search is gratefully acknowledged.

HE002535

SURVEYS

Astin, A.W. and Lee, C.B.T. Current practices in the evaluation and training of college teachers. Educ. Record, 1966, 47 (3), 361-375.

In the spring of 1966, the American Council on Education initiated a survey to ascertain current techniques for the evaluation of undergraduate instruction. The authors report a detailed analysis of the major results of this survey. A questionnaire was sent to the deans of the entire population of higher educational institutions. Among the 1,110 usable questionnaires, the most frequently indicated source of information for evaluation of teaching effectiveness was evaluations by the dean and department chairmen. Systematic student ratings were poorly developed.

Blackman, A.F., Fletcher, J.L., and Yanofsky, S.M. Students rate their profs and course. Phi Delta Kappan, 1967, 48 (6), 266-269.

Reports on a booklet resulting from student opinion of courses and faculty replies. Except for a few percentages, no data. Incomplete sampling information.

Blank, L.F. Relationships between student instructional ratings and student-faculty psychological types. Wisconsin State University, Oshkosh, March 1970, 11p. ED 040 422.

Found no significant differences in student ratings between student types (assessed by Myers-Briggs Type Indicator), but student opinion differed on different faculty types.

Bresler, J.B. Teaching effectiveness and government awards. Science, 1968 160, 164-167.

Governmental support and publication frequency was found to be directly related to rankings of teacher effectiveness.

Brewer, R.E. and Brewer, M.B. Relative importance of ten qualities for college teaching determined by pair comparisons. J. Educ. Res., 1970, 63 (6), 243-246.

Reports three studies showing how similar several groups of students rate teacher traits.

Carney, R.E. and McKeachie, W.J. Personality, sex, subject matter and student ratings. Psychol. Record, 1966, 16 (2), 137-144.

A good study with replications across courses, institutions, and different instructors and student backgrounds.

Carpenter, F., Van Egmond, E., and Hochem, J. Student preference of instructor types as a function of subject matter. Science Educ., 1965, 49 (3), 235-238.

Students rated verbal descriptions of three "types" of instructors.

Costin, F. A graduate course in the teaching of psychology: description and evaluation. J. Teacher Educ., 1968, XIX (4), 425-432.

Describes the relationships between a seminar in the teaching of psychology and later student ratings of the participants.

Crawford, P.L. and Bradshaw, H.L. Perception of characteristics of effective university teachers: a scaling analysis. Educ. Psychol. Meas., 1968, 28, 1079-1085.

Compares ratings of teachers by faculty members, university administrators, and university students.

deBruin, H.C. Quality instruction. Impr. Coll. Univ. Teach., 1967, 15 (4), 214-215.

Questionnaire given to author's students. Incomplete description of procedures. No data.

deBruin, H.C. Personality concepts in relation to quality teaching. Education, 1969, 89 (3), 241-243.

Uncommonly poor study.

Dillman, T. When college students grade the faculty. Today's Educ., 1970, 59 (2), 62, 71.

Poorly reported study.

Dizney, H.F. and Yamamoto, K. Graduate education students' preferences among professors. Psychol. in the Schools, 1967, 4 (1), 33-35.

Replication and extension of Yamamoto and Dizney (1966).

Elliott, C.K. Longitudinal use of a student-constructed teacher evaluation form. Brit. J. Educ. Psychol., 1969, 39 (3), 309-313.

Careful development of a student generated evaluation form.

Estrin, H.A. Effective and ineffective engineering instructors. Impr. Coll. Univ. Teach., 1965, 13 (3), 137-139.

Description of a well-established program of student ratings, including some data.

Freehill, M.F. Authoritarian bias and evaluation of college experiences. Impr. Coll. Univ. Teach., 1967, 15 (1), 18-19.

An incompletely reported study which purports to show that high authoritarian students are more critical of instruction.

Gadzella, B.M. College students' views and ratings of an ideal professor. Coll. & Univ., 1968, 44, 89-96.

Most relationships found between ratings and student related characteristics were small.

Gates, M. and Burnett, C.W. Students' perceptions of professors. Impr. Coll. Univ. Teach., 1969, 17 (4), 234-236.

Q sorts used to assess perceptions.

Harvey, J.N. and Barker, D.G. Student evaluation of teacher effectiveness. Impr. Coll. Univ. Teach., 1970, 18 (4), 275-278.

Examines the relationships between students' gross subjective judgments and their responses to a typical rating scale.

Heinz, E. Student opinion survey. Grossmont College, 1967, 45p. ED 017 233.

Published ratings produced as a result of the survey.

Hussain, K.M. and Leestamper, R. Survey on criteria of teaching effectiveness at New Mexico State University, June 1968, 53p. ED 023 365.

The survey spans four universities as well as faculty, students, and alumni. All groups agreed that the most important criterion was "being well prepared for class".

Kelly, R. and Hart, B.D. Professor role preferences of entering college students and their parents. J. Educ. Res., 1969, 63 (4), 150-151.

A poorly described study which compares the evaluation of possible professor roles (research, teaching, and character development) by college freshmen and their parents.

Kent, L. Student evaluation of teaching. Educ. Record, 1966, 47 (3), 376-406.

This article reports on the important survey initiated by the American Council on Education as described by Astin and Lee (1966).

Krupka, J.G. Report on faculty and student evaluation of instructor rating questionnaire, March 1970, 11p. ED 038 964.

Compares the relative importance of 12 areas in instruction among faculty and students at a community college.

Lathrop, R.G. Unit factorial ratings by college students of courses and instructors, 1968, 12p. ED 028 686.

Found that perceived learning is one of the factors significantly influencing ratings of faculty. One of the few articles in the literatuve to offer a theoretical framework.

Lewis, L.S. Students' images of professors. Educ. Forum, 1968, 32 (1), 185-190.

Found a generally favorable image. Demographic characteristics of the respondents did not affect the ratings.

Musella, D. and Rusch, R. Student opinion on college teaching. Impr. Coll. Univ. Teach., 1968, 16 (6), 137-140.

Mailed a questionnaire to college seniors in order to identify professors considered to have improved student thinking and to obtain opinions of behaviors that promote thinking.

Orange Coast College. Instructor rating scale study, March 1969, 6p. ED 028 775.

Brief report of the mean ratings of 26 instructors.

Overturf, C.L., Jr. and Price, E.C. Student rating of faculty at St. Johns River Junior College, with addendum for Albany Junior College. 1966, 32p. ED 013 066.

Found negligible relationships between ratings of instructors and student, instructor and situational (e.g. hour of class) characteristics.

Pearce, F.C. Basic education teachers--seven needed qualities. Modesto Junior College, California, September 1966, 19p. ED 010 677.

Poorly reported study drawing unwarranted conclusions.

Perry, R.R. Evaluation of teaching behavior seeks to measure effectiveness. Coll. Univ. Bus., 1969, 47 (4), 18, 22.

Two-page report of the ranking of 60 criterion behaviors developed from categorizing 13,643 behaviors.

Pervin, L.A. Satisfaction and perceived self-environment similarity: a semantic differential study of student-college interaction. J. Personality, 1967, 35 (4), 623-634.

One of several studies by Pervin which uses TAPE (Transactional Analysis of Personality and Environment). Develops an interactive model to explain students' perceptions of themselves, the faculty, and the college.

Pervin, L.A. and Rubin, D.B. Student dissatisfaction with college and the college dropout: a transactional approach. J. Social Psychol., 1967, 72 (2), 285-295.

Similar to Pervin's other studies.

Pogue, F.G., Jr. Students' ratings of the "ideal teacher". Impr. Coll. Univ. Teach., 1967, 15 (2), 133-136.

Reports Negro-white differences in what the respondents expect of teachers.

Quick, A.F. and Wolfe, A.D. The ideal professor. Impr. Coll. Univ. Teach., 1965, 13 (3), 133-134.

Respondents ranked ten descriptive statements.

Rankin, E.F., Jr., Greenmun, R., and Tracy, R.J. Factors related to student evaluations of a college reading course. J. Reading, 1965, 9 (1), 10-15.

Found that student evaluations of a reading course tend to be more closely related to evaluations of the teacher than to any measured improvement in reading.

Rayder, N.F. College student ratings of instructors. J. Exp. Educ., 1968, 37 (2), 76-81.

Concludes that student ratings are relatively unbiased since they are not much related to either student or instructor characteristics.

Rezler, A.G. The influence of needs upon the student's perception of his instructor. J. Educ. Res., 1965, 58 (6), 282-286.

Found that specific need patterns (on Edwards Personal Preference Schedule) are not associated with specific patterns of perception of instructor (on Purdue Rating Scale for Instruction). However, a sex x need interaction was found.

Schmidt, R. (ed.). Insight: a view of the faculty through the eyes of their students. Palomar College, San Marcos, California, 1968, 128p. ED 023 405.

Presents a rating form, instructions, and the ratings received by specific faculty members.

Smith, A.W. SET: students evaluate teaching, 1969, 12p. ED 035 392.

Describes a student rating program involving recorded class sessions, conferences, and class discussions. The SET program is viewed as producing raw data for application of the critical incident technique.

Spaights, E. Students appraise teachers' methods and attitudes. Impr. Coll. Univ. Teach., 1967, XV (1), 15-17.

On the basis of GPA, a High Achiever and a Low Achiever group were developed. The two groups differed in responses to instruction evaluation forms.

Spencer, R.E. and Aleamoni, L.M. A student course evaluation questionnaire. J. Educ. Meas., 1970, 7 (3), 209-210.

A course evaluation questionnaire, based upon 50 items and used at 13 different institutions, is briefly described.

Stallings, W.A. and Singhal, S. Some observations on the relationships between research productivity and student evaluations of courses and teaching, February 1969, 10p. ED 027 838.

Report significant, but low correlations which provide some support for the assertion that a productive researcher tends to be a good teacher.

Stewart, C.T. and Malpass, L.F. Estimates of achievement and ratings of instructors. J. Educ. Res., 1966, 59 (8), 347-350.

Contrary to the bulk of the research, the authors reported that students expecting high grades rated their instructors significantly higher than did those expecting low grades. Year in school was also found to be correlated with the ratings.

Very, P.S. Real and ideal characteristics of the teacher-student relationship. Percept. Motor Skills, 1968, 27 (3), 880-882.

Respondents were given the same Likert rating scale under two different sets. Seven differences were found, e.g. agreed that students take advantage of permissive professors (real) but this is not an appropriate thing to do (ideal).

Very, P.S. and Dye, N.W. Conceptualizations of the college teacher. Percept. Motor Skills, 1966, 22 (3), 889-890.

Report adjective sorts for real and ideal teachers.

Witheiler, P. and Yuker, H.E. Course evaluations at Hofstra University, 1969, March 1970, 24p. ED 040 661.

Report on the development and use of an evaluation questionnaire. A larger percentage of graduate students reacted favorably to most items than undergraduates.

Yamamoto, K. and Dizney, H.F. Eight professors--a study on college students' preferences among their teachers. J. Educ. Psychol., 1966, 57 (3), 146-150.

Student preferences for different types of college professors were studied. Teacher, researcher, socialite, and administrator were preferred in that order. In agreement with most of research, no sex differences in responding were obtained.

Yamamoto, K. and Dizney, H.F. College students' preferneces among four types of professors. J. Coll. Student Personnel, 1968, 9 (4), 259-263.

Extension of Yamamoto and Dizney (1966).

Doctoral Dissertations

Cox, J.B. The relationship between student ratings of teachers and value differences between teachers and students. Dissert. Abs., 1968, 29 (5-A), 1357.

Nichols, M.G. A study of the influences of selected variables involved in student evaluations of teacher effectiveness. Dissert. Abs., 1968, 28 (8-A), 2908.

Sorey, K.E. A study of the distinguishing personality characteristics of college faculty who are superior in regard to the teaching function. Dissert. Abs., 1968, 28 (12-A), 4916.

Walker, B.D. An investigation of selected variables relative to the manner in which a population of junior college students evaluate their teachers. Dissert. Abs., 1969, 29 (9-B), 3474.

Warren, P.B. A study of lower class and middle-upper class students' perception of the behavior traits of the effective teacher. Dissert Abs., 1968, 29 (2-A), 523.

Williams, H.Y., Jr. College students' perceptions of the personal traits and instructional procedures of good and poor teachers. Dissert. Abs., 1967, 27 (11-A), 3644.

FACTOR ANALYTIC SURVEYS

Caffrey, B. Lack of bias in student evaluations of teachers. Proceedings of the 77th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Assn., 1969, 4 (2), 641-642.

A factor analysis of the responses of 139 students resulted in five stable factors: teaching ability, feedback to students, negative attitudes, student overload, and structure. Personal qualities of the teacher, sex of the student, grades in the class, and overall GPA did not influence student assessment of teacher performance.

Hall, D.T. The effect of teacher-student congruence upon student learning in college classes. J. Educ. Psychol., 1970, 61 (3), 205-213.

Applies Pervin's concept of person-environment fit to learning in college classes. The aspect of the person studied was the student's perception of an Ideal Teacher Style. The aspect of the environment considered was the student's perception of his instructor's Teacher style. The congruence between the ratings of these two instruments did not predict learning as well as the ratings of Teacher Style alone.

Kerlinger, F.N. Attitudes toward education and perception of teacher characteristics: a Q study. Amer. Educ. Research J., 1966, 3 (3), 159-168.

The central underlining hypothesis of several of Kerlinger's studies is that perceptions of the traits of effective teachers are, in part, a function of the student raters' attitudes toward education. A factor analysis of a Q sort instrument resulted in three factors: progressive, traditional, and an unnamed factor.

Kerlinger, F.N. The factor structure and the content of perceptions of desirable characteristics of teachers. Educ. Psychol. Meas., 1967, 27 (3), 643-656.

A carefully executed study which replicates factor structures across several samples from different schools. The three named first order factors included positive person orientation, systematic task organization, and functional flexibility. The second order factors were not successfully replicated.

Kerlinger, F.N., and Pedhazur, E.J. Educational attitudes and perceptions of desirable traits of teachers, Feb. 1967, 16p. ED 011 868.

Found that those students who characterized themselves as having progressive philosophies of education tended to perceive person-oriented traits as desirable for teachers, whereas traditionists selected task-oriented traits as desirable. Two second order factors were found: progressivism and traditionalism.

Kerlinger, F.N. and Pedhazur, E.J. Attitudes and perceptions of desirable traits and behaviors of teachers. Final report, September 1967, 281p. ED 019 742.

A long final report to Kerlinger and Pedhazur (February 1967). The February version was later published with the same title in Ameri. Edu. Res. J., 1968, 5 (4), 543-560.

Meredith, G.M. Dimensions of faculty-course evaluation. J. of Psychol., 1969, 73 (1), 27-32.

The responses of 1,097 students to two instructor evaluation forms were factor analyzed. Two of the nine factors (instructor impact and instructional impact) accounted for 64 per cent of the rotated variance.

Pervin, L.A. A twenty-college study of student x college interaction using TAPE (Transactional Analysis of Personality and Environment): rationale, reliability, and validity. J. Educ. Psychol., 1967, 58 (5), 290-302.

Applied the TAPE analysis to 3,016 students from 21 colleges. It was found that the discrepancies between student perceptions of themselves and their college were related to dissatisfaction with college. Information concerning the reliability, validity, and factorial structure of TAPE is included.

Rees, R.D. Dimensions of students' points of view in rating college teachers. J. Educ. Psychol., 1969, 60 (6), 476-482.

Eleven types of teachers were rated by 65 students on 20 semantic differential scales. A factor analysis yielded seven labeled factors: socio-economic, racial, social studies aptitude, class in school, masculine sophistication, social disposition, and emotional instability. The conceptions students have of teachers are influenced, in part, by the personality traits and background experiences of the students themselves.

Solomon, D. Teacher behavior dimensions, course characteristics, and student evaluations of teachers. Amer. Educ. Res. J., 1966, 3 (1), 35-47.

The responses of the students in the classes of 229 teachers (total N is not reported) to a student questionnaire were factor analyzed. The 10 factors extracted were similar to those found in an earlier study by the author.

Turner, R.I., Evans, J.H., Hale, T.A., Cairns, S.G., and Maleski, F.D. How do student characteristics affect their evaluations of instructors. Indiana Univ. Sch. Educ. Bull., 1969, 45 (4), 47-97.

A well executed study based upon Fiedler's cubic leadership model which postulates an interaction between the characteristics of the leader, the characteristics of the group, and the complexity of the tasks. In agreement with the model, the authors found that different types of students prefer different types of instructors.

Yonge, G.D. and Sassenrath, J.M. Student personality correlates of teacher ratings. J. Educ. Psychol., 1968, 59 (1), 44-52.

An interesting study in which 227 students taught by three instructors completed an instruction rating form and a personality test. Correlations between factor scores and the personality test indicated that in some cases, the same personality variable correlated with a given factor score in opposite directions from one instructor to another. The authors develop an interactive point of view.

Doctoral Dissertations

Apt, M.H. A measurement of college instructor behavior. Dissert. Abs., 1967, 27 (10-A), 3298-3299.

Owen, P.H. Some dimensions of college teaching: an exploratory study using critical incidents and factor analyses of student ratings. Dissert. Abs., 1967, 27 (12-B), 4590.

Taylor, R.E. An investigation of the relationship between psychological types in the college classroom and the student perception of the teacher and preferred teaching practices. Dissert. Abs., 1969, 29 (8-A), 2575-2576.

EXPERIMENTS

Miklich, D.R. An experimental validation study of the Purdue Rating Scale for Instruction. Educ. Psychol. Meas., 1969, 29 (4), 963-967.

A rating scale was given to two classes taught by the author. One class was Psychological Statistics which the author had taught before and found enjoyable and the other class was Introductory Psychology which the author felt unprepared for and disinterested. Predicted differences were obtained.

Sharon, A.T. Eliminating bias from student ratings of college instructors. J. appl. Psychol., 1970, 54 (3), 278-281.

Students were administered evaluation forms under one of four instructional conditions. The instructional conditions had no effect on the forced-choice ratings but had a significant effect on the graphic ratings. It was concluded that the forced-choice scale is resistant to bias in student ratings.

Sharon, A.T. and Bartlett, C.J. Effect of instructional conditions in producing leniency on two types of rating scales. Personnel Psychol., 1969, 22, 251-263.

A more complete description of the well executed study by Sharon (1970).

Woolford, G.A. Teacher influence in a college of education. Educ. Res., 1969, 11, 148-152.

A study employing appropriate control groups in which it was found that students preferred patterns of teacher influence encouraging participation regardless of ability, sociometric status, and personality traits.

Doctoral dissertation

Thomas, H.B., Jr. Changing teacher behavior: an experiment in feedback from students to teachers. Dissert. Abs., 1969, 30 (5-A), 1903-1904.

REVIEWS

Boyer, M. Teacher evaluation: toward improving instruction, January 1970, 4p. ED 035 408.

Three approaches to instructor evaluation are discussed: student evaluation by questionnaire, instructor self-appraisal, and team evaluation.

Cohen, A.M. and Brawer, F.B. Measuring faculty performance, 1969, 81p. ED 031 222.

A monograph which includes 1) a discussion and appraisal of methods currently used, and 2) a case for changing the purposes, methods and criteria of faculty assessment. 128 ref.

Dehart, F.E. Teacher evaluation by students. J. Educ. for Librarianship, 1969, 10 (1), 33-38.

A short discussion citing seven references.

Department of Agriculture Graduate Schools. Faculty Handbook. Part II. Improving teaching, 1967, 79p. ED 024 854.

Teacher evaluation is discussed within a broad context of adult learning. Includes 24 references, Allport's teacher evaluation plan, a self-evaluation check-list and an appendix of teaching techniques.

Eble, K.E. The recognition and evaluation of teaching. Project to Improve College Teaching, Salt Lake City, Utah, 1970.

Includes the how's and why's of improvement of teaching, student evaluation instruments, and the relationship between student evaluation and faculty review. Six unpublished studies are included in the appendix and an extensive, two-part bibliography is attached.

Eidell, T.L. and Kleve, J.A. Annotated bibliography on the evaluation of educational programs, November 1968, 19p. ED 025 857.

Only a few references to student evaluation of instruction are included.

Finn, S.R. (ed.). Characteristics of the effective college teacher, September 1969, 9p. ED 032 841.

Presents a selected sample (11) of empirical studies pertaining to the perceived desirable characteristics of the effective college teacher.

Fitch, N. Evaluation of instructors in California junior colleges, 1965, 84p. ED 014 959.

A paper developed as a requirement for a college course. Includes a series of excerpts concerning policies and procedures for instructional evaluation at 23 California junior colleges.

Harvard University. Bibliography on teaching. Supplement, July 1966, 13p. ED 011 306.

Includes about 100 unannotated references (1960-1966) from several areas, one of which is teacher evaluation.

Herge, H.C. The College Teacher. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1965, pp. 25-31, 83-87.

Chapters 2 and 4 include a simplified discussion of teacher evaluation. Old references cited.

Highland Community College. Evaluation of community college instruction: a background study, 1970, 31p. ED 039 876.

Includes a nine-page discussion, three appendices and 30 selected references.

Kilpatrick, G. Another look at teacher evaluation in American junior colleges, 1967, 38p. ED 020 720.

A cookbook essay on how to evaluate, why and then what to do. Includes recommended guidelines for teacher evaluation and a 40-item student opinion questionnaire as appendices. 41 pre-1965 ref.

Leigh, T. A selected and annotated bibliography on evaluating performance of college faculty members [Occasional Paper No. 8], 1969, 30p. ED 035 376.

Includes 56 entries (1961-1968) dealing with methods, procedures, and problems involved in faculty evaluation by students, administrators, and peers.

McKeachie, W.J. Student ratings of faculty. AAUP Bulletin, 1969, 55 (4), 439-444.

A very useful article in which the author examines the same misconceptions and studies as he did in a 1957 article. A 17-item form is attached.

McKeachie, W.J. Training Tips: A Guide-Book for the Beginning College Teacher. Ann Arbor: George Wahr Publishing Co., 1965, pp. 158-167, 184-188, 191-208.

Chapter 22 includes a discussion based upon the author's 1957 article. Extensive pre-1965 bibliography.

Miller, C.D. and Haase, R.F. Student evaluation of teachers' competence and effectiveness, March 1967, 15p. ED 012 708.

Discuss four techniques to study the criterion problem, misconceptions regarding evaluation, and microteaching (teaching for short periods and immediate feedback).

Remmers, H.H. The college professor as the student sees him: II. Studies in Higher Educ., 1966, No. 93, 14-18.

The author lists 18 conclusions presumably based upon his research and a literature review, but the conclusions are not documented separately.

Robinson, L.H. Improving college teaching through faculty selection and evaluation: a review, July 1970, 4p. ED 040 309.

Includes summaries of successful and proposed criteria for measuring faculty performance and barriers to their use. 22 ref.

Slobin, D.Y. and Nichols, D.G. Student rating of teaching. Impr. Coll. Univ. Teach., 1969, 17 (4), 244-248.

Deals with objections to student evaluation of faculty as McKeachie (1969) did. Also includes a comparison of two factor analytic studies: when similar items are chosen, similar factors are revealed.

Sorenson, G. and Gross, C.F. Teacher appraisal: a matching process, April 1967, 26p. ED 016 299.

Authors' basic tenet is that a definition of teaching success which is formulated in terms of some single fixed teacher ideal is both untenable and inappropriate, i.e. different raters have different expectancies. Some good ideas. 29 ref.

NON-EMPIRICAL ARTICLES

Arden, E. Faculty as teachers. Educ. Forum, 1968, 32 (1), 447-452.

Bryant, P.T. By their fruits ye shall know them. J. Higher Educ., 1967, 38 (6), 326-330.

College Management. When students grade their teachers, 1970, 5 (3), 24-26.

Geheen, R.F. The teacher in the university. American Scientist, 1966, 54 (2), 221-225.

Hammond, P.E., Meyer, J.W., and Miller, D. Teaching versus research: sources of misperceptions. J. Higher Educ., 1969, 40 (9), 682-690.

Karman, T.A. Faculty evaluation. Liberal Educ., 1969, 55 (4), 539-544.

Lynes, R. The teacher is an iceberg. Junior Coll. J., 1966, 36 (7), 8-12.

Marshall, M.S. Academic anomaly. Liberal Educ., 1969, 55 (2), 279-282.

O'Brien, J.C. The professor stands trial. Educ. Forum, 1969, 34 (1), 39-45.

Renner, R.R. A successful rating scale. Impr. Coll. Univ. Teach., 1967, 15 (1), 12-14.

Samalonis, B. Ratings by students. Impr. Coll. Univ. Teach., 1967, 15 (1), 11.

Shane, H.G. How do they rate you, professor? NEA J., 1965, 54 (8), 18-20.